

DISTRICT II ADVISORY BOARD

Minutes – July 17, 2000

The District II Advisory Board meeting was held at 7 p.m. at the Patrol East Substation, 350 S. Edgemoor.

Members Present

David Babich
Michele Chauncey
Tod Ford
Charlotte Foster
John Fuller*
Mary Herrin
Alice James
Shirley Jefferson
Susan Leasure

Members Absent

Tom Byrne
George Laham
Mike Pompeo
Eric Russell*

Guests

Brad Allen
Patrick Bauer
Chris Carrier, Storm Water Engineer
Peggy Foltz
Jody Haugen
Jack Hull
Mary Pat Hull
Scott Knebel, MAPD
Margaret Miller

* Denotes alternate DAB member

Council Member Pisciotte called the meeting to order at 7:05 p.m.

Michele Chauncey (Ford) moved that the minutes of the June 5, 2000 meeting be approved as submitted. The motion passed (8-0).

Michele Chauncey (Foster) moved the agenda be approved as submitted. The motion passed (8-0).

No items were submitted for the public agenda, unfinished business, traffic agenda, or the planning agenda.

NEW BUSINESS

1. Backyard Drainage Policy

Chris Carrier, Storm Water Engineer, presented the Sedgwick County/City of Wichita Backyard drainage policy. The policy was developed in conjunction with the Wichita Area

Builders Association in response to issues developing within newer subdivisions. The policy addresses issues with homes being built with walk-out basements that have flat slopes which drain to the rear lot lines. These flat slopes are creating drainage problems. The policy requires developers to submit a drainage plan prior to plot approval. The developer will also be required to specify which type of house design is appropriate for the plot. The policy has been approved by City Council and will go to the County Commission July 26th. The policy will take effect 60 days after the County gives approval.

2. Management of City Solid Waste and Storm Debris after Brooks Landfill Closes

Item will be rescheduled at a later date.

3. Wireless Communication Master Plan

Scott Knebel, MAPD, presented the Wireless Communication Master Plan. In 1999 the City of Wichita passed a six month moratorium and retained a consulting firm to develop a wireless communication plan. A draft of the plan was presented to an enbanc workshop and the MAPC in November 1999.

The City and County Managers established a joint staff task force to: 1) review the consultant plan; 2) reconsider the impact on industry; 3) meet with stakeholders; and 4) provide revised or new plan as appropriate.

The current requirements are: 1) towers are permitted with conditional use in SF-20 and RR districts and by right in GC and more intensive districts; 2) mounting antennas on other structures treated as accessory use; 3) minimize the number of towers by requiring location on existing tower or other structure before new tower is constructed; 4) limits are placed on color, lighting and signs; 5) co-location for three users required on towers; 6) towers must be rebuilt for additional users; 7) abandoned towers must be removed; and 8) towers are subject to compatibility height standard when adjacent to TF-3 or less intensive zoning.

The shortcomings of the current system are: 1) the tower sites are limited by requiring GC zoning; 2) variance required to modify development standards like compatibility height standard; 3) focuses on towers not on facilities; and 4) there is no policy to guide review and approval of new wireless communication facilities.

The proposed new system includes location/height guidelines, design guidelines, structural design and co-location, rights of way, submittal requirements, and operation standards. The shortcomings of the current system are being addressed by: 1) facilities permitted in all zoning districts 2) administrative approval or conditional use rather than zone change and variance; 3) all wireless facilities addressed rather than just towers; and 4) policy guidance for review and approval of applications.

David Babich asked if a deposit had been considered to ensure companies destroy their towers as necessary. **Knebel** replied no, the City will have to file suit in order to enforce towers being

destroyed. **Charlotte Foster** inquired as to pays for land, maintenance and repairs of the towers. **Knebel** answered that the land is leased and the owner is responsible for repairs. **Tod Ford** asked if there will be any limits on towers being located in historic areas. **Knebel** replied there is a draft to not allow tower location in certain areas. **Babich** reiterated the benefits of required deposits due to the fact many of the tower owners are out of state and filing suit is a time consuming process. **Council Member Pisciotte** concluded the discussion by stating the need to balance community aesthetics and the need for cell phones.

BOARD AGENDA

4. Gate removal near Zimmerly & Dalton

In December 1998, the former traffic commission voted to remove a gate near the Zimmerly and Dalton intersection. The item was brought to City Council in January 1999 and by unanimous motion the Council voted to have staff monitor the traffic counts and accident reports for a report to be reviewed by City Council for a decision on whether the gate should remain open or be closed.

Residents who live in the area near the gate provided their reasons as to why the gate should be closed. **Jack Hull**, lives near the area and is concerned with the safety of children in the area and the number of school buses using the area as a shortcut. **Mary Pat Hull**, added she has counted an average of 25 buses daily. This large volume is reportedly causing cracks in the street. There are no sidewalks in the area and with many cars being parked on the street the area is potentially dangerous.

Council Member Pisciotte commented the gate removal may have changed the character of the neighborhood, and that he is concerned with the safety issues. He suggested continued monitoring of traffic volume and speed in the area. He offered to talk with USD 259 and the bus company to discuss their choice of routes.

5. Killarney & Tipperary briefing

Council Member Pisciotte mentioned the need to resolve the issue. The assigned subcommittee reported no new developments and **Council Member Pisciotte** stated he would handle the issue from this point on.

With no further business the meeting adjourned at 9 p.m.

Submitted by,

Donte Martin
Neighborhood Assistant, District II